

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 28, 2010, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the rejections based upon the claim amendments and arguments submitted herewith. Claims 7-13 were presented for examination, of which all were rejected, with the following issues being raised:

1. Claims 12 and 13 were objected to due to informalities; and
2. Claims 7-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,651,965 to Simonelli et al. ("Simonelli") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,966,516 to Vartanian ("Vartanian").

Following the above amendments to the claims, claims 7-13 remain pending in the application, with claim 7 being independent. By the amendments above, the informalities in claims 12 and 13 has been corrected. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 12 and 13 is therefore requested. Claims 7-10 have also been amended. Support for these amendments may be found at least within the claims as originally filed.

Obviousness Rejections

Claim 7 was rejected as obvious over Simonelli in view of Vartanian. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that all limitations of the rejected claim be taught or disclosed by the cited references. MPEP 2142. The combination of Simonelli and Vartanian fail to teach or disclose many features that are recited in claim 7.

Claim 7, as amended, recites that each of the first and second rectangular frames include "a first and a second rectangular frame, the two frames being affixed to each other by a first hinge" and "wherein each of the first and second rectangular frames include ... a first fixed floor section disposed distal from the first hinge; and a moving floor section". Simonelli discloses first and second fixed floor plates (34, 36), but each of these are *immediately adjacent* the first hinge (35) which joins the first and second rectangular sections. Simonelli therefore does not disclose that the first and second fixed plates are "disposed distal from the first hinge".

In addition, amended claim 7 recites that the moving floor section of each of the first and second rectangular frames is “movable between an extracted position, in which the first fixed floor section and the moving floor section are adjacently disposed such that both form a ramp floor surface, and a withdrawn position overlying the first fixed floor section and distal from the first hinge”. Simonelli does not disclose any moving floor sections as part of the rectangular frame, and especially not any moving floor sections which, with the respective fixed floor sections, forms the ramp floor surface.

Amended claim 7 also recites that each moving floor section “shifts into the withdrawn position due to gravity when the rectangular frames are moved into the folded position”. Since Simonelli does not teach any moving floor sections, it also does not teach such moving floor sections shifting into a withdrawn position due to gravity.

In another distinction, amended claim 7 recites that the suspension cable operatively extends “from the cable brake, to the first and second rectangular frames near the first hinge, and then to each of the moving floor sections”. However, as is clearly shown in Figs. 1 & 2 of Simonelli, the disclosed suspension cable extends only to one of the two fixed plates in only one of the rectangular frames—it does not extend to any moving floor sections. Moreover, amended claim 7 recites that “the suspension cable is configured to draw the moving floor section of each rectangular frame into the extracted position when the rectangular frames are moved into the deployed position”. However, the suspension cable disclosed by Simonelli extends only to one of the two fixed plates, and since Simonelli does not disclose any moving floor sections, the suspension cable therefore is not “configured to draw the moving floor section of each rectangular frame into the extracted position when the rectangular frames are moved into the deployed position”.

Turning to Vartanian, this reference fails to disclose any of the deficiencies noted in Simonelli above. For these reasons, the combination of Simonelli in view of Vartanian do not render amended claim 7 obvious.

Claims 8-13 were also rejected as obvious over Simonelli in view of Vartanian, and each ultimately depends from claim 7. Where the cited combination does not

render amended claim 7 obvious, it also does not render any of these dependent claims obvious.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections. Moreover, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned believes no extensions or fees are due with this filing. However, if an extension is needed or a fee is due, please consider this a request therefor and charge Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 21029-00312-US1, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: March 28, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

Electronic signature: /DMMorse/
David M. Morse
Registration No.: 50,505

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant